

REPRESENTATIVES OF DR. JOHN ROBERTS.

---

JUNE 10, 1842.

Read, and laid upon the table.

---

Mr. HALL, from the Committee on Revolutionary Claims, submitted the following

REPORT:

*The Committee on Revolutionary Claims, to which was referred the petition of the representatives of Dr. John Roberts, submit the following report :*

The petitioners claim the commutation pay of a surgeon for the service of Dr. John Roberts, in the Virginia continental line, to the end of the war.

In 1818, Samuel Hopkins, who was a lieutenant colonel in the Virginia line, says Dr. Roberts was appointed surgeon's mate to the 6th regiment, in May, 1776, and that early in 1777 he was appointed surgeon to the same regiment, and served as such, under his inspection, till April, 1779, when witness was ordered to the south, and saw no more of him till 1781, when, on his return to Virginia, he found him still in office in the army, and has *always understood* his service continued to the end of the war. J. Pryor says he thinks General Hopkins is quite correct in his statement of the services of Dr. Roberts; that he remembers he was officially employed in attending on indisposed officers of the army in 1782 and 1783. John Fowler, in 1831, says that he knew Dr. John Roberts served as a surgeon in the Virginia line to the end of the war. Robert Porterfield, a revolutionary officer, in 1836, says that in December, 1779, when the troops of the Virginia line marched from Morristown for South Carolina, Dr. Roberts was with them, and that he was also with the troops at Petersburg, Virginia, in March, 1780; but that the troops were then newly organized, and Dr. Roberts did not march to the south with them. He knows nothing further of the service of Dr. Roberts, except that on his return to Virginia, in 1781, he found him near Richmond, performing, *as he understood*, the duties of surgeon to such troops as were there from time to time, and that *he verily believes* Dr. Roberts did not resign until the close of the war.

The petition in this case was presented as early as 1835, and on the 10th of May, 1836, an unfavorable report was made upon it by Mr. Muhlenberg, from the Committee on Revolutionary Claims. All the evidence now presented by the claimants appears to have been before that committee; and after reciting it in detail, Mr. Muhlenberg's report proceeds to state

“that it appears, from the records of Virginia, that under the act of Assembly, passed November session, 1781, Dr. Roberts was settled with by that State, and allowed pay as a continental officer only to the 1st day of March, 1780, the precise time at which General Porterfield certifies he left him in Virginia, in consequence of the troops having been reorganized.” The committee then say that they are of opinion that Dr. Roberts served in the continental line only until the 1st of March, 1780, and “that his service afterwards, if any were rendered, must have been under the authority of the State of Virginia; and that the pay certificate of the auditor of Virginia, which states that he was settled with the 31st of January, 1783, and then received the balance of his full pay as an officer of the continental line, to March 1, 1780, is conclusive evidence of his not having served longer in that line.” (See Rep. No. 640, 1st session 24th Congress.)

The case was again referred at the 2d session of the 25th Congress, and on the 10th of January, 1838, Mr. Muhlenberg, from the committee, again made an unfavorable report, based upon the same ground as the previous one. (See manuscript record of reports, vol. 4, p. 171.)

At the 1st session of the 26th Congress, the papers being again referred, Mr. Craig, from the Committee on Revolutionary Claims, on the 4th of April, 1840, made another unfavorable report upon it, in which it is considered and reported by the committee, that the certificate of Dr. Roberts's settlement, made with the State of Virginia in 1783, is conclusive evidence that his service in the continental line terminated the 1st of March, 1780, the day to which he was paid.

It will be perceived, from this brief history of the case, that the committees have heretofore uniformly concurred in the opinion that the certificate of the auditor of Virginia, of the term of service for which Dr. Roberts was paid, was conclusive evidence of the time of his actual service; and when it is remembered that those former committees were extremely liberal in their allowance of this class of claims, a strong presumption is furnished that they were right in this particular. These decisions of the committee went upon the ground that, in 1783, when the facts in regard to the service of Dr. Roberts were fresh and well known, it was to be presumed that he would have claimed and have been allowed pay to a later period than March 1, 1780, if he had continued longer to serve; and that the reason of his having then omitted to claim and receive pay must have been that he was not entitled to it.

In opposition to this conclusion of former committees, a new construction of the act of Virginia, under which the settlement with Dr. Roberts was made, has been suggested to this committee. It is said that the object of the first section of the act referred to (see 10 Henning's Statutes, 462) was to provide for cases where officers and soldiers had previously made settlements of their accounts, and had received, in discharge of their pay, depreciated paper, and to allow them the difference between the value of the paper and their pay in specie, where the officer or soldier remained in the service up to the time of the passage of the act; and that the object of the second section was to provide for cases where the officer and soldier had received *no pay* for some space of time before his leaving the service. It is inferred that Dr. Roberts, although he had continued in service to the close of the war, may not have received his pay in depreciated paper to a later date than March 1, 1780, in which case it is supposed his pay, under the first section of the act, would not have been credited to a later period,

and of consequence that the settlement furnishes no evidence that his service then terminated; but that the settlement is merely evidence that he had not received his pay in paper to a later period. (A copy of the first and second sections of the act is hereto appended.)

It appears to the committee that this is not the natural and proper construction of the act. The first clause of the first section is in the following words:

*"Be it enacted by the General Assembly, That the whole pay and subsistence of the officers and soldiers of the Virginia line, in continental service, shall be made equal to specie from the first day of January, one thousand seven hundred and seventy-seven; and that the auditors of public accounts do settle and adjust the pay and accounts of the said officers and soldiers from the first day of January, one thousand seven hundred and seventy-seven, to the last day of December, one thousand seven hundred and eighty-one."*

The language of this clause seems to be clear and explicit. It first declares that *the whole pay* of the officers and soldiers shall be made equal to specie from the first of January, 1777, and then directs the auditors to adjust their pay and accounts from January 1, 1777, to the last day of December, 1781. There is no intimation here, that the length of time for which an officer's accounts were to be settled was to depend in any manner upon the date of his receipt of paper money for his pay. His *whole pay* was to be made equal to specie from January 1, 1777, to December 31, 1781. Under this clause, it would be the duty of the auditors to credit the officer with the amount of his whole pay from the said 1st day of January, 1777, to the 31st of December, 1781. This would form one side of the account to be settled. The next clause of the section specifies the manner in which the other side of the account should be stated. It is as follows: "And the said auditors are hereby authorized and directed to estimate, in specie, all sums of continental and State money received by the said officers and soldiers, on account of their pay, within the period aforesaid, agreeably to the dates of their receipts, respectively, and according to a scale of depreciation hereafter mentioned and contained." Thus would be made up the debtor side of the accounts. Both sides of the account being stated, the balance would be struck, for the payment of which the next clause provides as follows: "and printed certificates, (on interest, &c.), expressing the sum in specie, shall, by the said auditors, be individually given to the said officers and soldiers, for the respective balances that may appear to be due them by the public." The remaining clause of the first section provides that the accounts of officers and soldiers, who had died in the service, should be settled in the same manner as those who still continued in the army.

The second section provides that the accounts of the officers and soldiers who had left the service, by resignation of the officers, or by the expiration of the time of service of the soldiers, should likewise be made good to them up to the time of their leaving the service. It then directs the auditors to return an exact list of the sums due, and the certificates granted therefor, to the treasurer of the State.

From these two sections, taken together, it would seem to have been the object of the Legislature to make good to the officers and soldiers whatever might be due them for their services between the 1st day of January, 1777, and the 31st of December, 1781. If an officer had served the whole period, he was to be paid for the whole period; if for a part of it, then for

so much and so long as he had served. In both cases he was to be credited for the whole service he had performed during that period, and charged with whatever had been paid him; and the whole of the charges made against him being reduced to specie value by the scale of depreciation, the balance was to be struck, and a certificate issued to satisfy it. A certificate of the auditor of Virginia, stating the service for which any officer was credited, would of consequence show, as has been heretofore supposed, what service the officer at the time of the settlement claimed, and was shown to have performed during that period, without any regard whatever to the date of his previous receipts of paper money.

That this was the course of proceeding under this act appears from a variety of evidence now before the committee. Thus, in the case of any officer who is known to have served to the end of the war, whose accounts have been examined, it is found he has been paid for his service to the 31st of December, 1781, without reference to the date of his receipt of paper money. The account of Lieutenant Thomas Ransdell, hereto appended, may be given as an instance, from which it appears that the last receipt of paper money by him, on account of his pay, was in March, 1780, while he is allowed for his services to the 31st of December, 1781. If the new construction contended for be correct, his pay ought to have been allowed only to March, 1780.

The last clause of the second section of the act of Virginia, which has been cited above, directed that a list of the certificates issued should be kept by the auditors, and returned to the treasurer. A list of the certificates was made, and is still preserved; and an authentic copy of the list, so far as relates to the certificates issued to the officers, is in possession of the committee. In this list there are entered, indiscriminately, the certificates issued under the first and second sections of the act, the list specifying the certificates issued to officers who had left the service by resignation prior to the passage of the Virginia act, as well as to those who were in service up to the 31st of December, 1781, and afterwards. Thus, the list contains the name of Lieutenant Joseph Holliday, to whom a certificate appears to have issued December 21, 1784, for £27 19s. 5d.; and, on referring to his account, the certificate appears to have issued for a service ending the 23d of July, 1777. By muster rolls in the Third Auditor's office, he appears to have resigned the same the 23d of July, 1777. (See Rep. of this session, No. 383. The name of Captain Joseph Micheaux is found on the list as having received a certificate March 27, 1783, for £82 11s. 4d. By his account he appears to have been paid for a service up to 24th December, 1777. His resignation is found among the Washington Papers, dated December 24, 1777. (See Rep. No. 393.) Many other similar cases might be mentioned. The same list also contains the name of Lieutenant Thomas Ransdell, before mentioned, also those of Colonel Samuel Hopkins, Captain Robert Porterfield, and nearly every other continental officer who is known to have served to the close of the war. These instances are mentioned to show that the list contains the names and amounts of certificates issued to all the officers, whatever might have been the length of their service, who were entitled to pay under the acts. On the list is contained the name of Dr. John Roberts, who appears to have received a certificate on the 31st of January, 1783, for £583 6s., and by his account it appears to have been issued for a service ending March 1, 1780. The date of his receipts for pay is not stated in the accounts; but, from the sum which had been paid



him in paper, it seems very clear that he must have received a part of it at a later date than the 1st of March, 1780. It should be remembered that Congress did not acknowledge the existence of the depreciation of their paper currency till the 18th of March, 1780; and that it was not until the 10th of April, 1780, that they resolved that the losses of the officers and soldiers of the army, by the depreciation of the paper which had been paid them, should be made good to them. Up to this period, therefore, the paymasters would not be authorized to advance to the officers or soldiers more than the nominal amount of their pay in paper money, however great might have been the depreciation. It appears by the account of Dr. Roberts (hereto appended) that previous to the settlement with him, in 1783, he had been paid £1,116 in paper money, being nominally £368 4s. more than the whole amount of the pay allowed him. Now, as this excess could not have been legally paid him previously to the 10th of April, 1780, it must be presumed to have been paid him afterwards. Upon this supposition, and upon the new construction of the Virginia act now contended for, his pay ought to have been allowed him to a later period than the 1st of March, 1780, and would have been if he had continued in service after that date. He must therefore, upon any construction of the act, have ceased to serve at the time to which he was paid.

It may be further remarked, that it appears, by the records in the office of the Third Auditor, that the State of Virginia paid the officers and soldiers of her continental line in full for the balance of their pay as well as depreciation, in pursuance of the act before mentioned, up to the 31st December, 1781. (See Mr. Hagner's letter, hereto appended.) These payments were charged to the United States, and allowed Virginia in the general settlement which took place in 1793. Now, if Dr. Roberts had served to the end of the war, he would have been entitled to receive his pay from Virginia up to December 31, 1781; and if he had not received it in the settlement which has already been described, he ought to have received it in some other settlement. On looking over the before-mentioned list of certificates issued by Virginia, it is not found that any other one was issued to him. That which was issued must of course have included all the pay that was due him.

The same construction of the act of Virginia of November session, 1781, which has been heretofore acted upon by the committee, is that given it by Mr. Heath, the auditor of that State, an officer of acknowledged capacity and integrity, who has the custody of all the records of the proceedings under that act, and is particularly familiar with the financial transactions of his State during the revolutionary period. In a letter to a member of the committee, which is hereto appended, written in answer to inquiries in regard to the construction of the said act and the proceedings under it, he speaks as follows: "I am perfectly clear that this construction (that of the committee) is the correct one, and that the views which are entertained in support of the contrary opinion are entirely erroneous. In every case that I have found, where the officer served to the 31st December, 1781, his full pay in specie is charged down to that period, without any regard to the time at which credit is given for pay, subsistence, and advances in depreciated currency."

But the opinion that the service of Dr. Roberts terminated the 1st of March, 1780, does not rest alone on the fact that he was paid only to that period under the Virginia act of 1781. In January, 1783, Dr. Roberts applied for and was allowed by the Executive of Virginia the land bounty

at State; and on a printed list of those allowances, which is found in document No. 30, appended to the journals of the House of Delegates for the session commencing in December, 1833, it appears that he was allowed for a service "*from January, 1776, to March, 1780.*" Application has been made to the proper office for a copy of the evidence on which this land bounty was granted, but it is said to have been lost or mislaid. But Mr. Heath, in his letter before mentioned, says that Dr. Roberts received the land warrant in person, that he has inspected the order for its allowance in the register's office, and "that it expressly states that the allowance is made to him for his services as regimental surgeon in the continental line, "*from June, 1776, until March, 1780.*" Here, then, is documentary evidence, about the construction of which there can be no doubt. In January, 1783, he applies in person for his land bounty, furnishes evidence that he served as surgeon until March, 1870, and receives his warrant for such service. If he had continued in service up to the time of his receiving the warrant, why does he furnish proof that it terminated in March, 1780? The inference is irresistible, that he had served no longer.

It appears, indeed, that in 1818 Dr. Roberts was allowed by the Executive of Virginia an additional land bounty for a service of over six years. But as this allowance was made long after Virginia had ceased to pay the bounty herself, and when the allowances were easily obtained, it furnishes no presumption that the service for which it was granted was actually performed. Besides, the committee are furnished with the evidence on which the grant was made, and it appears to have been on the affidavits of Colonel Hopkins and Mr. Pryor, which are filed in this case.

In regard to this evidence, and that contained in the other affidavits produced in this case, it may be observed, that though the witnesses are undoubtedly of the highest respectability, especially Colonel Hopkins and Captain Porterfield, yet, from its very nature, it is not entitled to be put in successful competition with the documentary evidence of a contrary character, which has been hereinbefore recited. It is taken after a lapse of many years, and taken ex parte, when the recollection of the witnesses would naturally be refreshed and sharpened by the suggestions of persons interested to procure favorable testimony; and its force depends wholly on the accurate remembrance of dates, about which men are, of all other things, most liable to mistake. But if it be admitted that the witnesses are correct in their recollection that Dr. Roberts did act as a surgeon in 1781, and afterwards, or, as Captain Porterfield expresses it, "was near Richmond, performing the duties of surgeon to such troops as were there from time to time," it would not necessarily follow that he was still an officer of the continental army. He might have been in the State service, or might have been rendering occasional professional services to the troops for professional pay, as was often done by practising physicians and surgeons, who did not in any sense belong to the army. In the case of Dr. Julian, (see Rep. 537,) such professional service is shown by the records of the Committee of Safety to have been performed; and Mr. Heath, in his letter, says that such services were frequently performed. That such was the case in this instance must be inferred from the fact that Dr. Roberts did not, in 1783, so far as is known, make any pretensions to have served after March, 1780.

It should be further remarked that, at the close of the war, Dr. Roberts could have had no difficulty in proving himself entitled to commutation if he had really performed the requisite service. Mr. Dunscomb, a commis-

sioner of the United States, was sent to Richmond at that period, for the purpose of making settlements with the officers and soldiers of the Virginia line, for their pay and commutation, and remained there, in the performance of that duty, for many months. The commutation of Dr. Roberts would have amounted to \$3,600. Is it probable that he would have applied for the balance of his pay, and omitted to ask for the much larger sum of commutation, if it had really been due to him? The fact that he applied for and received the one, and neglected to demand the other; that he lived more than forty years afterwards, until 1827, without ever claiming it; and that the present claim is hunted up by his heirs, who can know nothing about it, after a lapse of nearly sixty years, seems conclusive against its validity.

There being no satisfactory evidence that Dr. Roberts served to the end of the war, and thereby became entitled to commutation, the committee, in accordance with the reports of their predecessors, recommend that the claim be rejected.

---

*Part of an act passed at a General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia, begun and held at the public buildings in the town of Richmond, on Monday, 5th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1781.*

#### CHAPTER XIX.

AN ACT to adjust and regulate the pay and accounts of the officers and soldiers of the Virginia line on continental establishment, and also of the officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines, in the service of this State, and for other purposes.

SEC. 1. Whereas, from the depreciation of the paper money and other concurring circumstances, the pay of the officers and soldiers of the Virginia line on continental establishment hath been altogether inadequate to their services: To the end, therefore, that justice may be done and redress afforded, as far as the present circumstances of the State will admit:

*Be it enacted by the General Assembly,* That the whole pay and subsistence of the officers and soldiers of the Virginia line in continental service shall be made equal to specie from the first day of January, one thousand seven hundred and seventy-seven; that the auditors of public accounts do settle and adjust the pay and accounts of the said officers and soldiers from the said first day of January, one thousand seven hundred and seventy-seven, to the last day of December, one thousand seven hundred and eighty-one. And the said auditors are hereby authorized and directed to estimate, in specie, all sums of continental and State money received by the said officers and soldiers, on account of their pay, within the period aforesaid, agreeable to the dates of their receipts, respectively, and according to a scale of depreciation hereafter mentioned and contained; and printed certificates, (payable on or before the first day of January, one thousand seven hundred and eighty-five, with interest at the rate of six per centum per annum,) expressing the sum in specie, shall, by the said auditors, be individually given to the said officers and soldiers, for the respective balances that may appear to be due them by the public. And the said auditors shall, in like manner, settle and adjust the accounts of all officers and soldiers of the said line who have fallen or died in the service during the said period; and their lawful representatives shall be entitled to such cer-

tificates, and all other benefits and advantages hereby granted to the officers and soldiers now in the line.

SEC. 2. And whereas a number of officers and soldiers, who are now out of the service, by the resignation of the officers and expiration of the terms of the soldiers, received no pay for some space of time before their leaving the service, by which the public is considerably in arrears to them:

*Be it therefore enacted*, That the said auditors shall, in like manner, settle the accounts of the said officers and soldiers, to the time of their leaving the service, and grant them certificates for the sums that may be found due them in manner as hereinbefore directed, for the officers and private men now in the line. And the said auditors shall, after having adjusted and settled the accounts aforesaid, return an exact list, to the treasurer for the time being, of the sums due and certificates granted therefor, of which a correct account shall be kept by the treasurer, for his government, at the time the said certificates shall be redeemable; and, in the mean time, for the immediate relief of the officers of the line aforesaid, the auditors of public accounts are hereby directed to issue, immediately after the passing this act, to all such of the said officers who shall have been in the said line prior to the first day of May, one thousand seven hundred and seventy-seven, and still belong thereto, like certificates for the amount of two years' pay in specie, agreeable to the allowances made by a resolution of Congress of the twelfth day of August, one thousand seven hundred and eighty, payable as aforesaid, with interest at the rate of six per centum per annum; and to all such of the said officers who shall have come into the service since that period, similar certificates for the amount of one year's pay, provided they shall have been in service one year.

SEC. 3. *And be it further enacted*, That the wages of the said officers and soldiers shall, in future, be regularly paid in specie, or the value thereof, once in every quarter of a year at least.

I certify that the above is a true and correct copy of a law passed by the General Assembly of Virginia, as expressed at the heading of this act, from the laws of Virginia now in the Library of Congress.

EDW. B. STELLE,  
*First Assistant Librarian.*

---

AUDITOR'S OFFICE, VA., May 27, 1842.

SIR: I have been unavoidably prevented from replying earlier to yours of the 21st instant.

I send you a copy of a letter addressed by me to the honorable P. Triplet and others, on the 11th March last, containing my construction of the act of November, 1781. I am perfectly clear in the conviction that this construction is the correct one, and that the views which are entertained in support of the contrary opinion are entirely erroneous. In every case that I have found, where the officer served to the 31st of December, 1781, his full pay in specie is charged down to that period, without any regard to the time at which credit is given for pay, subsistence, and advances in depreciated currency. I send you, by way of illustration, a copy of the settlement with Thomas Ransdell, by which it appears that the credits are given in March, 1780, and the charges brought down to December,



1781. In Roberts's account, a copy of which I also transmit, the credits are not dated. Roberts was allowed, in January, 1783, upon the order of the Executive, a warrant for 6,000 acres of bounty land, which warrant he received in person. I have myself inspected the order in the register's office, and it expressly states that the allowance is made to him for his services as a regimental surgeon in the continental line, from *June, 1776, until March, 1780*. It is very true, that subsequently (to wit: in the year 1818) he appears to have been allowed additional land bounty for services from May, 1782, to November, 1783, from which I infer that he may have re-entered the service in May, 1782, after having resigned in March, 1780. I send you a copy of the evidence upon which the additional land bounty was allowed; and I should also have sent a copy of the evidence upon which the original bounty was allowed, but it is unfortunately lost or mislaid. I cannot understand why Dr. Roberts, who received his warrant in 1783, in person, did not at that time claim all that he was entitled to. I consider the evidence of Hopkins and Pryor as vague and unsatisfactory, and I think the probability is, that Roberts ceased to belong to the army as a regimental surgeon in March, 1780, either by resignation or reduction, and that his subsequent services were temporary and professional merely, as was frequently the case.

I am, very respectfully, yours,

JAMES E. HEATH, *Auditor of Va.*

Hon. H. HALL.

---

AUDITOR'S OFFICE, VA., *March 11, 1842.*

GENTLEMEN: Confinement for several days to the house, by indisposition, is my apology for this tardy reply to your letter of the 4th instant.

The act of the Virginia Legislature of November, 1781, commonly called the depreciation act, authorized and directed that the depreciated pay which had been received by the officers and soldiers of the army, both in the State and continental line should be made equal to specie, according to a scale prescribed in the act. This scale embraced the period of five years, from 1st of January, 1777, when the depreciation commenced, to the 31st of December, 1781, when it ended and gave place to the specie standard. In the settlement of these accounts at the auditor's office, the officer or soldier was of course charged with the amount he had received from the paymasters of the army, reduced by the scale of depreciation; and for the balance appearing due he received a certificate of State debt, bearing six per cent. interest. Unluckily, none of the books of settlement have been preserved, except those which relate to the Virginia continental line. The rest have been lost or destroyed; and hence the difficulty of tracing the precise period of service, in reference to the State line, and also in reference to the soldiers of both lines. You will observe that if any of my certificates of settlement should state that the officer served from the 1st of January, 1777, to 31st of December, 1781, it does not necessarily follow that he may not have entered the army prior to the first-mentioned period, and remained in it after the last-named time, because the previous and subsequent service would not appear on the books of settlement to which I have referred. If it should appear, however, that the settlement closed before the 31st of December, 1781, say on the 1st of November, 1781, I

should regard it as conclusive proof that the service of the officer terminated on the latter day, by resignation or otherwise, unless he was transferred to or promoted to a higher rank in *some other line*.

With respect to what was really the end of the war, the courts and the Executive of this State have, I believe, at different times adopted different rules. Formerly it was held that the war ended on the day of the proclamation of peace by the Governor of Virginia, which was in April, 1783. Subsequently, the day of the treaty of peace was considered as furnishing the best rule. Most of the Virginia lines, except Dabney's legion and the Western troops, were disbanded, I believe, in 1782.

I am, gentlemen, very respectfully, yours,

JAMES E. HEATH, *Auditor of Va.*

Hon. P. TRIPLETT and others.

Dr.

The United States in account with John Roberts.

Cr.

No. 638		£. s. d.			£. s. d.			£. s. d.		
	To pay as surgeon from 1st January, 1777, to 1st March, 1780	684	00	00	By pay and subsistence received at sundry times	-	-	1,116	00	00
	To retained rations - -	63	16	00	By sundries of Mr. Hite	-	-	-	-	-
					Certificates	-	-	583	06	00

JANUARY 31, 1783.

Sworn to before

H. RANDOLPH.

The above is truly copied from a book of settlements with the officers of the continental army of the Revolution.

Given under my hand, at the auditor's office, Richmond, this 23d day of May, 1842.

JAMES E. HEATH, *Auditor of Va.*

Rep. No. 871.

Dr.

## The United States in account with Thomas Ransdell.

Cr.

12

No. 643		£. s. d.		1780. March		£. s. d.		£. s. d.	
	To pay as lieutenant from 1st January, 1777, to 31st December, 1781 - -	480	00	00	By pay and subsistence received at sundry times -	460	14	00	64 00 10½
	To retained rations - -	51	10	00	By cash to recruit with -	3,000	00	00	60 00 00
					By sundries at Valley Forge	-			14 14 11
					Certificates - - -	392	14	03	

MARCH 1, 1783.

Sworn to before

ROBERT MITCHELL.

The above is truly copied from a book of settlements with the officers of the continental army of the Revolution.

Given under my hand, at the auditor's office, Richmond, this 23d day of May, 1842.

JAMES E. HEATH, *Auditor of Va.*

Rep. No. 871.



I, Samuel Hopkins, who was a lieutenant colonel in the 10th Virginia regiment on continental establishment, do hereby certify and declare, that Dr. John Roberts was first appointed surgeon's mate in May, 1776, in the 6th Virginia regiment; that early in 1777 he was appointed surgeon to the same regiment, and served under my inspection and command until the month of April, 1779; after which period, being myself ordered on duty in the Southern department, I can only certify that I left Dr. Roberts on duty at that time; and in 1781, on my return to Virginia, found him still in office in the army; and hence always believed and understood his services continued to the end of the revolutionary war, in 1783.

SAMUEL HOPKINS.

FRANKFORT, *August 12, 1818.*

The above statement, given by General Samuel Hopkins, from my own recollection, I think is quite correct; and, moreover, I well remember that Dr. Roberts was alternately at Petersburg and Richmond, and appeared to be officially employed in attending on indisposed officers of the revolutionary army, in 1782 and 1783, which was to the end of that war.

J. PRYOR,

*An Officer of the 1st Reg't of Artillery, Rev. War.*

I certify the above to be a true copy from the original.

J. W. PLEASANTS.

It appears from the record that a warrant for 6,000 acres issued to John Roberts, for services as regimental surgeon in the Virginia continental line, from June, 1776, till March, 1780, upon a certificate of council, dated 30th January, 1783.

THOMAS MILLER, *clerk.*

LAND OFFICE, *November 20, 1818.*

Dr. John Roberts claims additional bounty lands for services as a surgeon, from May, 1782, to November, 1783—one year and six months.

$\frac{1}{8}$  6,000

—  
1,000

500

—  
1,500 acres.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,

*Richmond, Virginia, May 26, 1842.*

The preceding two pages contain copies of papers filed in this department.

W. H. RICHARDSON, *Sec. Com.*

—  
TREASURY DEPARTMENT,

*Third Auditor's Office, May 27, 1842.*

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of 26th instant, inquiring whether it appears, from the records and papers in this

office, *to what period* the officers of the Virginia continental line were paid by the State of Virginia; and if so, whether their *whole pay* was made good to them up to that date, or whether it was only the difference between their pay and the value of the paper money they had received, and their actual pay up to the time they had last been paid in paper money; that you ask for this information, in consequence of a question which has arisen in the Committee on Revolutionary Claims; and you add, that you have always understood the whole pay was made good to 31st December, 1781.

In reply, I have to state that the payments made by Virginia to her continental line were for the balances of their full pay to 31st December, 1781, including depreciation per act of the General Assembly of Virginia, passed November session, 1781, chapter 27.

With great respect,

PETER HAGNER, *Auditor.*

Hon. HILAND HALL,

*Chairman of Committee on Revolutionary Claims, H. R.*



